

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

DONALD E. MORISKY,

Plaintiff,

v.

MMAS RESEARCH LLC, et al.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:21-CV-1301-RSM-DWC

ORDER GRANTING EXTENSION OF
TIME

On August 1, 2022, Defendants Steve Trubow and MMAS Research, LLC filed a Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction (“Motion for TRO”). Dkt. 69.¹ The Motion for TRO was noted for the Court’s consideration on the date it was filed. *See* LCR 7. Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 65, the party opposing the motion for a temporary restraining order has 48 hours to file a response. Plaintiff Donald E. Morisky has filed a Motion to Extend Time to

¹ The Court notes a motion for a temporary restraining order is a noted for the same day. *See* LCR 7. However, a motion for a preliminary injunction should be noted on the fourth Friday from the filing date. *Id.* at (d)(3).

1 Respond (“Motion to Extend”), seeking an extension until August 9, 2022, to file a response to
2 the Motion for TRO. Dkt. 72.

3 The Court has considered the Motion for TRO and the Motion to Extend. Based on the
4 record before the Court, the Court finds an extension of time to respond to the Motion for TRO is
5 appropriate.² Therefore, the Motion to Extend (Dkt. 72) is granted as follows:

- 6 • Plaintiff shall have until August 10, 2022 to file a response to the Motion for
7 TRO; and
- 8 • Defendants shall have until August 12, 2022 to file an optional reply.

9 The Clerk is directed to re-note the Motion for TRO (Dkt. 69) for August 12, 2022.

10 Dated this 3rd day of August, 2022.

11 

12 _____
13 David W. Christel
14 United States Magistrate Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 _____
24 ² Defendants did not stipulate to the extension of time. *See* Dkt. 72. The Court finds an extension of time is
appropriate and finds a response from Defendants is not necessary.